



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,759	12/26/2001	Yoshiko Maruyama	21772US2	1660
22850	7590	01/11/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
			EXAMINER	
			LETT, THOMAS J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2625		
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		01/11/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/025,759		MARUYAMA, YOSHIKO	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Thomas J. Lett		2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-119 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-119 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DOUGLAS O. THOMAS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Thomas

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 26 October 2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 24 August 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. The prior art of Choudhury et al clearly reads on the claimed element of "notification means for notifying a registered user of said printing apparatus of information on authority of the registered user to use said printing apparatus to execute any print job prior to the transmission of the request to execute the specific print job to be printed by the printing apparatus, but after the registered user has established access to use of said printing apparatus". Choudhury et al teach this feature since a user makes a document print/display request using a Print/Display Agent 11/13 and therefore a notification is sure to follow. Choudhury also teaches this feature in col. 4, lines 13-31. By example, the user would request to activate the functions of a printing device in order to print a document (col. 4, lines 27-31). A user could subsequently request another document or encrypted document to be displayed or printed after the user establishes activation of the printer device. Stated another way from the same cited lines of col. 4, lines 27-31: in order for a user to print a document, the user is required to, at the Print Agent, use an ID to request permission to print the specified document. Printing is clearly not an afterthought as Applicant has implied. The Printing Agent 13 will not allow decryption or printing of a specific

document retrieved from a document server unless a user is properly authorized. Functions such as display/print and access may not be achieved unless a user is properly authorized. For these reasons, the rejection of claims 1-119 is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takimoto et al (USPN 6,202,092 B1) in view of Choudhury et al (US 5,509,074).

With respect to claim 1, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system comprising:

a printing apparatus (printer 3, col. 4, lines 7-12, Fig. 1);

a terminal apparatus (server computer 2, col. 3, lines 52-58) for transmitting information including a request to execute a print job and receiving information;

notification means (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63.) for notifying a registered user of said printing apparatus of information on authority of the registered user to use said printing apparatus prior to the transmission of the request to execute the print job to be printed by the printing apparatus, but after the registered user has established access to use of said printing apparatus (the user has access to the printer but does not have access to print a certain document with a security feature); and

a network (network line (not shown), col. 4, lines 31-36) connecting said printing apparatus, said terminal apparatus, and said notification means so that information transmission and reception in the system is performed through an electrical signal via said network.

Takimoto et al does not disclose notifying a user prior to the transmission of the request to execute the print job to be printed by the printing apparatus.

Choudhury et al teach of a system that notifies a user 17 of validation by a copyright server 107 prior to viewing/printing a document, col. 3, lines 41-43, see at least Figs. 1-3 and col. 4, lines 13-21. "Authenticating a user's request" reads on notifying a user. Following the authentication, the printing is executed, col. 4, lines 19-21. A user makes a document print/display request using a Print/Display Agent 11/13 and therefore a notification is sure to follow.

Takimoto et al and Choudhury et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of network printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the pre-authentication feature of Choudhury et al to Takimoto et al in order to obtain a method of validating a user prior to a network request. The motivation for doing so would be to check a permission prior to submitting job information.

With respect to claim 2, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said network is a local area network (network line (not shown), col. 4, lines 31-36).

With respect to claim 3, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said printing apparatus comprises said notification means (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63 and are attached as discussed in col. 6, lines 62-67).

With respect to claim 4, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said notification means notifies the user (col. 5, lines 15-20) of the information on the authority of the user to use said printing apparatus through said terminal apparatus.

With respect to claim 5, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said notification means notifies the user of a change in the authority of the user (col. 5, lines 15-20) to use said printing apparatus when the change is effected.

With respect to claim 6, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 1, wherein said notification means notifies the user (col. 5, lines 15-20 and the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30) of an entry of the authority of the user to use said printing apparatus when said printing apparatus is newly introduced to the system.

With respect to claim 7, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 1, further comprising:

setting means for setting the authority of the user (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30) to use said printing apparatus; and

determination means (security validation portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-67) for determining whether to perform printing based on user information or job information included in a print job transmitted from said terminal apparatus and on the authority of the user to use said printing apparatus, wherein said setting means and said determination means are connected to said network.

With respect to claim 8, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 7, further comprising usage authority management means (print request analyzing portion 22a, col. 5, lines 3-14) for managing the authority of the user to use said printing apparatus, said

usage authority management means connected to said network and comprising said notification means.

With respect to claim 9, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 8, wherein said setting means, said determination means, said notification means, and said usage authority management means are realized by a processing operation of a central processing unit (Examiner notes that it is well-known for computing analysis of a system as that of Takimoto et al to be done by processor(s)).

With respect to claim 10, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 7, wherein: said terminal apparatus comprises:

inquiry means (step S21 of Fig. 5) for transmitting to said determination means an inquiry as to whether the user has the authority to use said printing apparatus; and presentation means for presenting the user with a result of the inquiry received from said notification means; and

said notification means (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63) notifies the user whether the user has the authority to use said printing apparatus upon receiving the inquiry transmitted from said inquiry means.

With respect to claim 11, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 10, wherein said inquiry means transmits the inquiry when said terminal apparatus is activated (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63).

With respect to claim 12, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 10, wherein said inquiry means transmits the inquiry before said terminal apparatus transmits a request to execute the print job to said printing apparatus (print request analyzing portion 22a, col. 5, lines 3-14).

With respect to claim 13, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 7, wherein the authority of the user to use said printing apparatus is set for each of functions of said printing apparatus (col. 5, lines 3-19).

With respect to claim 14, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 13, wherein said terminal apparatus further comprises means for modifying printing conditions of the print job so that the printing conditions exclude a printing condition using a function that the user is not authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 15, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 13, wherein said terminal apparatus further comprises means for modifying a printing condition of the print job which condition uses a function that the user is not authorized to use so that the printing condition uses only a function that the user is authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 16, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 13, wherein said terminal apparatus further comprises means for requesting the user to modify printing conditions of the print job so that the printing conditions exclude a printing condition using a function that the user is not authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 17, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 13, wherein said terminal apparatus further comprises means for requesting the user to modify a printing condition of the print job which condition uses a function that the user is not authorized to use so that the printing condition uses only a function that the user is authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 18, Takimoto et al disclose a printing system as claimed in claim 13, wherein said terminal apparatus obtains the information on the authority of the user set for each of the functions of said printing apparatus and presents the user with the obtained information before transmitting a request to execute the print job to said printing apparatus (see col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 19).

Takimoto et al does not disclose notifying a user prior to the transmission of the request to execute the print job to be printed by the printing apparatus.

Choudhury et al teach of a system that notifies a user of validation by a copyright server 107 prior to viewing/printing a document, see at least Figs. 1-3 and col. 4, lines 13-21.

“Authenticating a user’s request” reads on notifying a user. Following the authentication, the viewing or printing is executed, col. 4, lines 19-21.

Takimoto et al and Choudhury et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of network printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the pre-authentication feature of Choudhury et al to Takimoto et al in order to obtain a method of validating a user prior to a network request. The motivation for doing so would be to check a permission prior to submitting job information.

With respect to claim 19, Takimoto et al disclose a printing apparatus comprising:

a central processing unit (Examiner notes that it is well-known for computing analysis of a system as that of Takimoto et al to be done by processor(s)) controlling an operation of the entire printing apparatus; and

notification means (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63) for notifying a registered user of the printing apparatus of information on authority of the registered user to use the printing apparatus.

Takimoto et al does not disclose notifying a user prior to transmission of a request to execute a print job to be printed by the printing apparatus, but after the registered user has established access to use of said printing apparatus.

Choudhury et al teach of a system that notifies a user of validation by a copyright server 107 prior to viewing/printing a document, see at least Figs. 1-3 and col. 4, lines 13-21.

"Authenticating a user's request" reads on notifying a user. Following the authentication, the viewing or printing may be executed, col. 4, lines 19-21. A user makes a document print/display request using a Print/Display Agent 11/13 and therefore a notification is sure to follow.

Takimoto et al and Choudhury et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of network printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the pre-authentication feature of Choudhury et al to Takimoto et al in order to obtain a method of validating a user prior to a network request. The motivation for doing so would be to check a permission prior to submitting job information.

With respect to claim 20, Takimoto et al disclose a printing apparatus as claimed in claim 19, wherein said notification means is connected to a terminal apparatus via a network and notifies the user of the information on the authority thereof to use the printing apparatus through the terminal apparatus (network line (not shown), col. 4, lines 31-36).

With respect to claim 21, Takimoto et al disclose a printing apparatus as claimed in claim 20, wherein the network is a local area network (network line (not shown), col. 4, lines 31-36).

With respect to claim 22, Takimoto et al disclose a printing apparatus as claimed in claim 20, further comprising setting means (the user is authorized to read and modify the database, col. 4, lines 26-30) for setting the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus, said setting means being connected to the network.

With respect to claim 23, Takimoto et al disclose a printing apparatus as claimed in claim 20, wherein said notification means notifies the user of a change in the authority of the user to use said printing apparatus when the change is effected (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 24, Takimoto et al disclose a printing apparatus as claimed in claim 20, wherein said notification means (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63) notifies the user of an entry of the authority of the user to use said printing apparatus when said printing apparatus is newly introduced to the system.

With respect to claim 25, Takimoto et al disclose a printing apparatus as claimed in claim 20, wherein said notification means (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63) notifies the user whether the user has the authority to use said printing apparatus upon receiving an inquiry transmitted from the terminal apparatus.

With respect to claim 26, Takimoto et al disclose a printing apparatus as claimed in claim 25, wherein the authority of the user to use said printing apparatus is set for each of functions of the printing apparatus (the user is authorized to read and modify the database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 27, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus comprising:

a central processing unit (Examiner notes that it is well-known for computing analysis of a system as that of Takimoto et al to be done by processor(s)) controlling an operation of the entire terminal apparatus;

inquiry means (step S21 of Fig. 5) for transmitting an inquiry as to whether a registered user of a printing apparatus has authority to use the printing apparatus; and

presentation means (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63) for presenting the registered user with a result of the inquiry,

wherein the terminal apparatus is configured to receive information as to the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus, prior to transmission of a request to execute a print job to be printed by the printing apparatus.

Takimoto et al does not disclose notifying a user prior to transmission of a request to execute a print job to be printed by the printing apparatus, but after the registered user has established access to use of said printing apparatus.

Choudhury et al teach of a system that notifies a user of validation by a copyright server 107 prior to viewing/printing a document, see at least Figs. 1-3 and col. 4, lines 13-21. "Authenticating a user's request" reads on notifying a user. Following the authentication, the viewing or printing may be executed, col. 4, lines 19-21. A user makes a document print/display request using a Print/Display Agent 11/13 and therefore a notification is sure to follow.

Takimoto et al and Choudhury et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of network printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the pre-authentication feature of Choudhury et al to Takimoto et al in order to obtain a method of validating a user prior to a network request. The motivation for doing so would be to check a permission prior to submitting job information.

With respect to claim 28, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus as claimed in claim 27, wherein said inquiry means and said presentation means are connected via a network (network line (not shown), col. 4, lines 31-36) to the printing apparatus, determination means for determining whether to perform printing based on user information or job information included in a print job transmitted from the terminal apparatus and on the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus, and notification means for notifying the user of information on the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus so that said inquiry means transmits the inquiry to the

determination means and said presentation means receives the result from the notification means (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63).

With respect to claim 29, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus as claimed in claim 28, wherein the network is a local area network (network line (not shown), col. 4, lines 31-36).

With respect to claim 30, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus as claimed in claim 27, wherein said inquiry means transmits the inquiry when the terminal apparatus is activated (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63).

With respect to claim 31, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus as claimed in claim 27, wherein said inquiry means (print request analyzing portion 22a, col. 5, lines 3-14).

Takimoto et al does not disclose transmitting the inquiry before the terminal apparatus transmits a request to execute a print job to the printing apparatus.

Choudhury et al teach of a system that notifies a user of validation by a copyright server 107 prior to viewing/printing a document, see at least Figs. 1-3 and col. 4, lines 13-21.

"Authenticating a user's request" reads on notifying a user. Following the authentication, the viewing or printing may be executed, col. 4, lines 19-21. A user makes a document print/display request using a Print/Display Agent 11/13 and therefore a notification is sure to follow.

Takimoto et al and Choudhury et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of network printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the pre-authentication feature of Choudhury et al to Takimoto et al in order to obtain a method of validating a user prior to a network request. The motivation for doing so would be to check a permission prior to submitting job information.

With respect to claim 32, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus as claimed in claim 27, wherein the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus is set for each of functions of the printing apparatus (see col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 19).

With respect to claim 33, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus as claimed in claim 32, further comprising means for modifying printing conditions of the print job so that the printing conditions exclude a printing condition using a function that the user is not authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 34, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus as claimed in claim 32, further comprising means for modifying a printing condition of the print job which condition uses a function that the user is not authorized to use so that the printing condition uses only a function that the user is authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 35, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus as claimed in claim 32, further comprising means for requesting the user to modify printing conditions of the print job so that the printing conditions exclude a printing condition using a function that the user is not authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 36, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus as claimed in claim 32, further comprising means for requesting the user to modify a printing condition of the print job which condition uses a function that the user is not authorized to use so that the printing condition uses only a function that the user is authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 37, Takimoto et al disclose a terminal apparatus as claimed in claim 32, wherein the information on the authority of the user set for each of the functions of the printing apparatus is obtained (see col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 19).

Takimoto et al does not disclose presenting to the user before a request to execute the print job is transmitted to the printing apparatus.

Choudhury et al teach of a system that notifies a user of validation by a copyright server 107 prior to viewing/printing a document, see at least Figs. 1-3 and col. 4, lines 13-21.

“Authenticating a user’s request” reads on notifying a user. Following the authentication, the printing is executed, col. 4, lines 19-21. A user makes a document print/display request using a Print/Display Agent 11/13 and therefore a notification is sure to follow.

Takimoto et al and Choudhury et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of network printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the pre-authentication feature of Choudhury et al to Takimoto et al in order to obtain a method of validating a user prior to a network request. The motivation for doing so would be to check a permission prior to submitting job information.

With respect to claim 38, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method comprising the steps of:

(a) setting authority (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30) of a user of a printing apparatus to use the printing apparatus; and

(b) notifying (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63) the user of information on the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus through an electrical signal via a network (network line (not shown), col. 4, lines 31-36).

Takimoto et al does not disclose notifying a user prior to the transmission of the request to execute the print job to be printed by the printing apparatus.

Choudhury et al teach of a system that notifies a user of validation by a copyright server 107 prior to viewing/printing a document, see at least Figs. 1-3 and col. 4, lines 13-21.

"Authenticating a user's request" reads on notifying a user. Following the authentication, the viewing or printing may be executed, col. 4, lines 19-21. A user makes a document print/display request using a Print/Display Agent 11/13 and therefore a notification is sure to follow.

Takimoto et al and Choudhury et al are analogous art because they are from the similar problem solving area of network printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the pre-authentication feature of Choudhury et al to Takimoto et al in order to obtain a method of validating a user prior to a network request. The motivation for doing so would be to check a permission prior to submitting job information.

With respect to claim 39, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 38, wherein the network is a local area network (network line (not shown), col. 4, lines 31-36).

With respect to claim 40, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 38, wherein the printing apparatus performs said step (b) (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63 and are attached as discussed in col. 6, lines 62-67).

With respect to claim 41, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 38, wherein said step (b) notifies the user of the information on the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus through a terminal apparatus (col. 5, lines 15-20).

With respect to claim 42, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 38, wherein said step (b) notifies the user of a change in the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus when the change is effected (col. 5, lines 15-20).

With respect to claim 43, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 38, wherein said step (b) notifies the user of an entry of the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus when the printing apparatus is newly introduced (col. 5, lines 15-20).

With respect to claim 44, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 38, further comprising the step of (c) determining whether to perform printing based on user information or job information included in a print job and on the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63).

With respect to claim 45, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 44, wherein said steps (a) through (c) are performed by a processing operation of a central processing unit (Examiner notes that it is well-known for computing analysis of a system as that of Takimoto et al to be done by processor(s)).

With respect to claim 46, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 44, further comprising the steps of:

(d) inquiring (step S21 of Fig. 5) whether the user has the authority to use the printing apparatus; and

(e) presenting the user (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63) with a result of said step (d), wherein said step (b) notifies the user whether the user has the authority to use the printing apparatus when said step (d) is performed.

With respect to claim 47, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 46, wherein said steps (d) and (e) are performed by a terminal apparatus (server computer 2, see Fig. 1).

With respect to claim 48, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 46, wherein said step (d) is performed when a terminal apparatus is activated (the security data

base is recorded on the file device (fixed disk) 23 on the server computer, and only the printer driver 22 on the server computer 2 can modify the security data base, col. 4, lines 45-48).

With respect to claim 49, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 46, further comprising the step of (f) transmitting a request to execute the print job to the printing apparatus, wherein said step (d) is performed before said step (f) (print request analyzing portion 22a, col. 5, lines 3-14).

With respect to claim 50, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 49, wherein said step (f) is performed by a terminal apparatus (server computer 2, col. 3, lines 52-58).

With respect to claim 51, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 49, wherein said steps (d) through (f) are performed by a processing operation of a central processing unit (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30) through an electrical signal via the network (network line (not shown), col. 4, lines 31-36).

With respect to claim 52, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 46, wherein the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus is set for each of functions of the printing apparatus (see col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 19).

With respect to claim 53, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 52, further comprising the step of (f) modifying printing conditions of the print job so that the printing conditions exclude a printing condition using a function that the user is not authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 54, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 53, wherein said step (f) is performed by a terminal apparatus (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 55, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 52, further comprising the step of (f) modifying a printing condition of the print job which condition uses a function that the user is not authorized to use so that the printing condition uses only a function that the user is authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 56, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 55, wherein said step (f) is performed by a terminal apparatus (server computer 2, col. 3, lines 52-58).

With respect to claim 57, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 52, further comprising the step of (f) requesting the user to modify printing conditions of the print job so that the printing conditions exclude a printing condition using a function that the user is not authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 58, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 57, wherein said step (f) is performed by a terminal apparatus.

With respect to claim 59, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 52, further comprising the step of (f) requesting the user to modify a printing condition of the print job (print request analyzing portion 22a, col. 5, lines 3-14) which condition uses a function that the user is not authorized to use so that the printing condition uses only a function that the user is authorized to use.

With respect to claim 60, Takimoto et al disclose a printing method as claimed in claim 59, wherein said step (f) is performed (print request analyzing portion 22a, col. 5, lines 3-14) by a terminal apparatus.

Claim 61 is rejected for the same reason as claim 38.

Claim 62 is rejected for the same reason as claim 39.

Claim 63 is rejected for the same reason as claim 40.

Claim 64 is rejected for the same reason as claim 41.

Claim 65 is rejected for the same reason as claim 42.

Claim 66 is rejected for the same reason as claim 43.

Claim 67 is rejected for the same reason as claim 44.

With respect to claim 68, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 67, wherein said program causes the computer to further execute the steps of:

(d) inquiring (step S21 of Fig. 5) whether the user has the authority to use the printing apparatus; and

(e) presenting the user with a result of said step (d), wherein said step (b) notifies the user whether the user has the authority to use the printing apparatus when said step (d) is performed (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63).

With respect to claim 69, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 68, wherein the computer causes a terminal apparatus to perform said steps (d) and (e) (server computer 2 containing a security validating portion 22b, col. 3, lines 59-63).

With respect to claim 70, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 68, wherein said step (d) is performed when a terminal apparatus is activated (the security data base is recorded on the file device (fixed disk) 23 on the server computer, and only the printer driver 22 on the server computer 2 can modify the security data base, col. 4, lines 45-48).

With respect to claim 71, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 68, wherein said program causes the computer to further execute the step of (f) transmitting a request to execute the print job to the printing apparatus, wherein said step (d) is performed before said step (f) (print request analyzing portion 22a, col. 5, lines 3-14).

With respect to claim 72, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 71, wherein the computer causes a terminal apparatus to perform said step (f) (server computer 2, col. 3, lines 52-58).

With respect to claim 73, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 71, wherein said steps (d) through (f) are performed through an electrical signal via the network (via a network line (not shown), col. 4, lines 31-36).

With respect to claim 74, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 68, wherein the authority of the user to use the printing apparatus is set for each of functions of the printing apparatus (see col. 3, line 59 – col. 4, line 19).

With respect to claim 75, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 74, wherein said program causes the computer to further execute the step of (f) modifying printing conditions of the print job so that the printing conditions exclude a printing condition using a function that the user is not authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 76, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 75, wherein the computer causes a terminal apparatus to perform said step (f) (server computer 2, col. 3, lines 52-58).

With respect to claim 77, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 74, wherein said program causes the computer to further execute the step of (f) modifying a printing condition of the print job which condition uses a function that the user is not authorized to use so that the printing condition uses only a function that the user is authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 78, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 77, wherein the computer causes a terminal apparatus to perform said step (f) (server computer 2, col. 3, lines 52-58).

With respect to claim 79, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 74, wherein said program causes the computer to further execute the step of (f) requesting the user to modify printing conditions of the print job so that the printing conditions exclude a printing condition using a function that the user is not authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 80, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 79, wherein the computer causes a terminal apparatus to perform said step (f) (server computer 2, col. 3, lines 52-58).

With respect to claim 81, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 74, wherein said program causes the computer to further execute the step of (f) requesting the user to modify a printing condition of the print job which condition uses a function that the user is not authorized to use so that the printing condition uses only a function that the user is authorized to use (the user is authorized to read and modify the security database, col. 4, lines 26-30 and see col. 6, lines 14-23).

With respect to claim 82, Takimoto et al disclose a storage medium as claimed in claim 81, wherein the computer causes a terminal apparatus to perform said step (f) (server computer 2, col. 3, lines 52-58).

Claim 83 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 1.

Claim 84 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 2.

Claim 85 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 3.

Claim 86 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 4.

Claim 87 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 5.

Claim 88 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 6.

Claim 89 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 7.

Claim 90 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 8.

Claim 91 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 9.

Claim 92 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 10.

Claim 93 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 11.

Claim 94 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 12.

Claim 95 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 13.

Claim 96 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 14.

Claim 97 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 15.

Claim 98 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 16.

Claim 99 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 17.

Claim 100 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 18.

Claim 101 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 19.

Claim 102 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 20.

Claim 103 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 21.

Claim 104 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 22.

Claim 105 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 23.

Claim 106 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 24.

Claim 107 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 25.

Claim 108 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 26.

Claim 109 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 27.

Claim 110 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 28.

Claim 111 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 29.

Claim 112 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 30.

Claim 113 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 31.

Claim 114 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 32.

Claim 115 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 33.

Claim 116 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 34.

Claim 117 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 32.

Claim 118 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 33.

Claim 119 is rejected for the same reason as that of claim 34.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Lett whose telephone number is (571) 272-7464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number:
10/025,759
Art Unit: 2625

Page 24

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TL/

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
EXAMINER
Translous